



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|

00000000 00000000 00000000 00000000

PM11/00001

SPENCER D. FRANK
1100 NEW YORK AVENUE NW
SUITE 300
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3905

EXAMINER

00000000

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

00000000

DATE MAILED:

03/21/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
08/983,474

Applicant(s)
KLATZMAN et al

Examiner
Nirmal. S. Basu

Group Art Unit
1646



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Dec 23, 1999.

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-18, 20, and 22-26 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-8, 10, 12, 14, 15, 17, 20, 23, and 26 is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 2, 9, 18, 22, 24, and 25 is/are rejected.

☒ Claim(s) 11, 13, and 16 is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____.

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 11

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Art Unit: 1646

DETAILED ACTION

1. Amendment filed 12/23/99 and 9/27/99 have been entered.
2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action (4/27/00).

Response to Amendment

Specification

3. The oath or declaration submitted 10/28/98 (paper number 6) remains defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02. Applicants arguments have been considered but not found persuasive. The oath or declaration is defective because: the date is incomplete, the applicant has written "8 X" to indicate month and day. The applicant argues that use of roman numeral X for the month of October is acceptable and the supplemental declaration needs no correction. The use of Roman and Arabic numerals together, as in instant case, to sign an oath or declaration is not the normal acceptable practice, either in the U.S.A. or France.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejection, 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph,

4. Claims 2, 9, 11, 13, 22, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 1646

Claims 2 and 22, as amended, are indefinite because the claim refers to SEQ ID NOs: 7, 8, 9 and 10, said SEQ ID NOs are not contained in the application.

Claim 9 is remains indefinite as it is not clear what is a CD4 derivative. Applicants arguments have been considered but not found persuasive. The term derivative encompasses modifications and mutations of the CD4. The CD4 derivative has not been defined in the specification nor claims so as to allow the metes and bounds of the claim to be determined. It is not clear what the derivative includes and excludes.

Claim 11, line 2, "contains" should be changed to "containing" to be grammatically correct.

Claim 11 remains indefinite as it is not clear what is "a derived molecule" so as to allow the metes and bounds of the claim to be determined. What is the derived molecule and what is it derived from?

Applicant was non-responsive to this rejection.

Claim 13, line 6, "transduced" should be changed to "transducing" to be grammatically correct.

Claim 18 recites the limitation "A medicament" in claim 17. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claim 17 recites a "A composition".

Claim 24 is indefinite as it is not clear which SEQ ID NO: amino acids 498, 510, 185 and 199 are referring to. The afore mentioned fragments must be refereed to by SEQ ID NO:.

Claim 25 remains indefinite because the claim does not further limit claim 1 on which it depends. Claim 25 refers to, "distance between the cysteine residues of the C-terminal fragments of the α chain is greater or lesser than 12, and the distance between the cysteine residues of the C-

Art Unit: 1646

terminal fragment of the β chain is greater or lesser than 14". The distances of greater or lesser than 12 and greater or lesser than 14 cover all conceivable distances and therefore do not provide a meaningful limitation to the claim. Applicant was non-responsive to this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, First Paragraph

5 5. Claim 18 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for recombinant multimeric protein, comprising a fusion polypeptide (linked by disulfide bridges) consisting of monomer A and monomer B of C4BP containing heterologous polypeptides in relation to the alpha and beta chains, does not reasonably provide enablement for medicaments and their uses in therapy or prophylaxis of foetomaternal alloimmunization, viral,
10 bacterial or parasitic infections, disseminated lupus erythematosus, or other alloimmune or autoimmune diseases. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. Applicants arguments have been fully considered but not found persuasive.

15 The specification lists many applications which the protein of the claimed invention might or might be expected to be useful for, including: immunointervention in human immune pathologies (page 3). The specification has not taught how to treat medical conditions requiring any of the above actions. Although the specification states the object of the present invention is to achieve "immunointervention in the immune pathologies" (page 3, line 14-23), there is no disclosure of any results with the claimed fusion protein in assays, and the actual functional properties remain
20 unknown. One skilled in the art cannot predict which fusion proteins might yield positive results.

Art Unit: 1646

The effect of administration of the claimed fusion protein, which has no disclosed homology with other known proteins, for medical conditions is unpredictable. Furthermore, using said fusion proteins for therapy or prophylaxis would require undue experimentation.

The unpredictability in the art is shown by Haynes (Ref. A). Haynes states, "major scientific
5 obstacles blocking the development of a successful preventative HIV vaccine are the extraordinary
variability of HIV, the lack of an exact animal model or HIV-induced AIDS and the lack of
understanding of the correlates of positive immunity to HIV", see abstract, page 39. Further Haynes,
states that, "Current animal model of either HIV or simian immunodeficiency virus (SIV) fall short
of precisely mirroring human HIV infection(10). In some such models, such as the chimpanzee,
10 animals do not develop AIDS. Other models lack immune responses analogous to human anti-HIV
T and B-cell responses. Therefore many immunotherapeutic agents would be expected to be inactive
in other species. In addition, owing to the extreme complexity of the host-tumor immuno-
relationship, animal models do not fully mimic the biology of human patients with cancer. Finally,
the immune system is obviously different in humans and animals, and it is not surprising that
15 immunotherapeutic agents fail to demonstrate comparable activity in animals and humans. For all
these reasons it will be necessary to develop immunotherapy intended for humans in humans. Further
the complexity of immune-based therapies in HIV infections and AIDS is highlighted by Fahey et al.
Fahey et al disclose, "Initial therapies aiming to alter immune function in patients with HIV infection
have had mixed results", see abstract. Further disclosed are that soluble CD4, CD4-IgG, immune
20 serum/gammaglobulin, murine MoAbs to gp120 core loop have all been unsuccessful for the effective

Art Unit: 1646

therapy for viral infections, see RECEPTOR DIRECTED TREATMENT, page 3. Some of the *in vitro-in vivo* discrepancy may be explained in part by the observation that viruses isolated from patients receiving, e.g. CD4 therapy, were 2 logs less sensitive than laboratory strains, page 3, column 1, second paragraph.. Also circulation through the liver and the kidney *in vivo* can reduce the persistence of therapeutic agents markedly, page 4, column 2, first paragraph. Further instant application claims fusion proteins, e.g containing antibodies, for treating various diseases but hasnot disclosed any specific constructs that may be effective in such treatments. The epitope used to raise the antibody, nor the diseases they treat are not disclosed. Due to the large quantity of experimentation necessary to produce and isolate functional fusion polypeptides and the lack of direction/guidance presented in the specification regarding such polypeptides, the lack of working examples, the complex nature of the diseases claimed, e.g HIV infection, the unpredictability of the effects of immunotherapeutic agents in the treatment of such disease, lack of animal models, as discussed above, and the breadth of the claims which claim therapy of a spectrum of diseases without disclosure of effective chimeric polypeptides for their successful treatment, undue experimentation would be required of the skilled artisan to make and /or use the claimed invention in its full scope.

6. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a recombinant multimeric protein comprising CD4, does not reasonably provide enablement for derivative of CD4. The, specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Art Unit: 1646

While the person of ordinary skill in the art would, in light of the specification be able to make recombinant multimeric proteins comprising fusions with CD4, the scope of the claims, which encompass other fusion proteins comprising derivatives of CD4 without specific activity are not enabled by the disclosure. The disclosure does not teach how to make and purify such fusion derivatives, teach which alterations to CD4 would result in functional fusion derivatives, or to use a commensurate number of said fusion derivatives without functional activity. Further the disclosure does not disclose the structural limitations required to produce truncated fusion polypeptides of said derivatives. Instant specification does not teach which particular amino acids are critical for the active derivative. In other words, such structurally deficient derivatives containing random mutations would be expected by the skilled artisan to result in inactive proteins. For example, Rudinger (Ref C) states on page 3 that "it is impossible to attach a unique significance to any residue in a sequence. A given amino acid will not by any means have the same significance in different peptide sequences, or even in different positions of the same sequence". Rudinger further states on page 6 that "the significance of particular amino acid sequences for different aspects of biological activity cannot be predicted *a priori* but must be determined from case to case by painstaking experimental study". Therefore, the lack of guidance provided in the specification as to what minimal structural requirements are necessary for functional derivative, would prevent the skilled artisan from determining whether any modification or mutation to the CD4 molecule could be made which retains the desired function of the instant invention, because any random mutation or modification manifested within said protein itself would be predicted to adversely alter its biologically active 3-dimensional

Art Unit: 1646

conformation, without undue experimentation to determine otherwise. Due to the large quantity of experimentation necessary to identify and purify active derivatives, the lack of direction/guidance presented in the specification regarding the identification, purification, isolation and characterization of said derivatives, the unpredictability of the effects of mutation on the structure and function of CD4 derivatives, disclosure on how to use a commensurate number of derivatives lacking functional activity and the breadth of the claim which fail to recite functional limitations, undue experimentation would be required of the skilled artisan to make or use the claimed invention in its full scope.

7. Claims rejected 2, 9, 18, 22, 24 and 25

8. Claims 1, 3, 4-8, 10, 12, 14-15, 17, 20, 23 and 26 allowed.

9. Claims 11, 13, 16 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 1646

Advisory Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nirmal Basi whose telephone number is (703) 308-9435. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 9:00 to 5:30.

5

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Kunz, can be reached on (703) 308-4623. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-0294.

10

Official papers filed by fax should be directed to (703) 308-4242. Faxed draft or informal communications with the examiner should be directed to (703) 308-0294.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

15

Nirmal S. Basi
Art Unit 1646
March 10, 2000

Gary L. Kunz
GARY L. KUNZ
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1200